

19 NOV 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Management and Services

SUBJECT : DD/M&S Control of M&S Positions and
Personnel

REFERENCE : M&S Advisory Group Memo dtd 15 Oct 1973,
same subject

1. Attractive as the idea appears at first blush, the control of DD/M&S positions as outlined in the referent memorandum has more pitfalls than advantages.

2. To begin with, the historic command and control exercise by the operating elements continues to be a valid process to ensure that the operator has at his disposal the assets he believes necessary to perform his mission. Second, in any operational situation it is clear that there must be one "boss" who has the authority to act and to make decisions relevant to the component's mission. To change the current system could lead to a fragmentation or split of responsibility and, in given instances, create a situation where operations could be deprived of the necessary degree of coordination and management. Indeed, in certain cases an operating chief might claim relief of responsibility for mission failure because he couldn't control or dictate the support requirements he felt necessary to his mission.


3. The comment in the referent memorandum that M&S control of its positions would provide for better long-range planning of M&S resources is not valid, since the level of M&S resources is directly related to the operational requirements of the Agency and these are subject to change over which the DD/M&S would have no control. I further fail to see how the control of DD/M&S positions would lead to "better qualified and experienced M&S personnel," since the totality of M&S positions for which we are responsible determines the degree of qualifications and experience required and, here again, the totality of our requirements is based upon operational considerations and programs.

OL 3 6098a

SUBJECT: DD/M&S Control of M&S Positions and Personnel

4. With respect to the comment that DD/M&S control of "his positions" would effect better management control throughout the DD/M&S, I think the case is overstated. Basically, the major bone of contention about "positions" lies in the overseas areas and yet these represent a relatively small portion of any DD/M&S office's total positions--in fact in the Office of Logistics the overseas positions represent less than 10 percent of the total Logistics Career Service positions. Thus, getting "control" of these positions would not materially affect overall management and control, and I suspect that what is true of OL is true of most other offices within the DD/M&S.

5. In summary, to change from the present system of position control to that outlined in the referenced memorandum would, I think, result in a loss of control that the operator needs to accomplish his mission, could "saddle" the DD/M&S with a responsibility that is both unnecessary and outside the envisioned role of the DD/M&S and would not, in my opinion, improve either the long-range planning of management and control of DD/M&S resources nor effect a better qualified and experienced core of DD/M&S personnel.


Francis B. Van Damm
Director of Logistics

STATINTL